

REMARKS

Miscellaneous Claim Amendments

Applicant has amended Claims 27-29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 40, and 42 to correct various informalities and antecedent basis issues.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 25-30, 32, 35-36 and 38-39 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being unpatentable over Hofsass *et al.* (US 5,522,040).

Applicant has amended independent claims 25 and 39 to clarify that the method and integrated circuit employ a pair of logically complementary error lines (3, 4). The logically complementary nature of the pair provides improved immunity against communication errors between a microprocessor and other devices. The pair of error lines are shown in Fig. 1, reference numerals (3,4).

Hofsass does not describe a pair of logically complementary error lines. Instead, Hofsass employs a single line in each direction as is known in the prior art (Hofsass Fig. 1, lines 3,5).

Applicant respectfully submits that Hofsass does not provide a pair of logically complementary error lines (3, 4) and therefore does not anticipate amended Claims 25 and 39.

Claims 26-30, 32, 35-36 and 38 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 25 and are believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 25.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 41 and 45-46 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hofsass *et al.* (US 5,522,040) in view of McCormick (US 5,488,872).

Applicant has amended independent claim 41 to clarify that the integrated circuit includes a pair of logically complementary error lines (3, 4). The logically complementary nature of the pair provides improved immunity against communication errors between a microprocessor and other devices. The pair of error lines are shown

in Fig. 1, reference numerals (3,4).

Hofsass does not describe a pair of logically complementary error lines. Instead, Hofsass employs a single line in each direction as is known in the prior art (Hofsass Fig. 1, lines 3,5).

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Hofsass and McCormick does not provide a pair of logically complementary error lines (3, 4) as required by amended Claim 41. Since the combination of Hofsass and McCormick does not provide all the elements of amended Claim 41 the combination can not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claim 41.

Claims 45-46 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 41 and are believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 41.

Claims 31, 33-34, 37, 40, 42-44 and 47 depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claims 25, 39, and 41 and are believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as Claims 25, 39, and 41.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant believes that the claims as amended overcome the raised objections and rejections and are in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edwin W. Bacon, Jr./

Edwin W. Bacon, Jr.
Registration No. 39,098
Continental Teves, Inc.
One Continental Drive
Auburn Hills, MI 48326
(248) 393-6405
Attorney for Applicants